

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 26 are pending, and claims 1 – 26 stand rejected. Claim 1 has been amended. The applicant respectively traverses the rejection and requests allowance of claims 1 – 26.

Claim 1 is objected to because “s” should be removed from “the communications system” in line 14 of claim 1. The “s” has been deleted.

Claims 1, 7 – 9, 11 – 12, 14, 20 – 22, and 24 – 25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Naboulsi et. al. (US 5,805,591). Claim 1 requires a DSL interface inside the user communication hub to communicate with a communication system using an analog phone line.

Naboulsi does not use an analog phone line for the link between the hub and the communication system. In Naboulsi the link between the hub and the system uses a coaxial cable (see column 4, lines 25 – 30). Coaxial cables (i.e. cable TV) are separate systems connected to households and are independent of phone distribution systems. The examiner states that lines from POTS 87, 89 through analog ports 78, 80 are analog phone lines. The examiner is correct that lines 78 and 80 are analog phone lines. However lines 78 and 80 do not connect the hub device (26) with the communication system. Lines 78 and 80 connect the hub device (26) with two telephones inside the user location. Line 25 in figure 1 is a coaxial cable and connects hub device (26) with communications system 10 (see column 4, lines 25 – 30). It is this link between the hub device and the communication system that is required by claim 1 to be an analog phone line.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. V. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed Cir. 1987). Because Naboulsi uses a coaxial cable and not an analog phone line as the link between the hub and the communication system, the examiner has not met the *prima facie* case for anticipation and claim 1 is allowable as written.

Claims 2 - 13 depend on allowable claim 1. Therefore claims 2 - 13 are also allowable.

Claim 14 also includes the analog phone line requirement. Therefore the arguments for claim 1 (above) apply to claim 14 and claim 14 is allowable as amended.

Claims 15 - 26 depend on allowable claim 14. Therefore claims 15 - 26 are also allowable.

Conclusion

Based on the above remarks, the Applicants submit that claims 1 - 26 are allowable. There may be additional reasons in support of patentability, but such reasons are omitted in the interests of brevity. The Applicants respectfully request allowance of claims 1 - 26.

Any fees may be charged to deposit account 21-0765.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 4/6/05



SIGNATURE OF PRACTITIONER

Steven L. Webb, Reg. No. 44,395

Setter Ollila LLC

Telephone: (303) 938-9999 ext. 22

Facsimile: (303) 938-9995